The Kidnap Kissinger Conspiracy, P. 2

The "Understanding" Too Few Understand

There has been discussion regarding our "understanding" with North Vietnam. The implication is that we will resume the bombing if they do not live up to the bargain. Who is kidding whom? We stopped the bombing because it was a failure. It is said the North Vietnamese hated the bombing, and that this proves it was doing some good. Certainly they hated it. They hated it so much they united against the threat they could see in their skies. The harder we bombed, the harder the other side tried, and the more American men paid with their lives. If President Nixon resumes it, he will be signing the death warrants of thousands of American troops.—*Leggett* (D. Cal.) *in the House Jan. 2. (abr.)*

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 2 JANUARY 25, 1971 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

The Dollars and Sense of The Nixon Doctrine

"Mr. Nixon," William H. Lawrence of ABC News wrote in the *New York Times* Jan. 12, "simply does not like to level." He was writing of Nixon's press conferences. Ambivalence and ambiguity are hardly unfamiliar tools of government. But Nixon is exceptionally adept at hiding his aims. Who knows where he stands on the SALT talks, still treading water after two years? Or what Vietnamization means in his private dictionary?* The outstanding example is the Nixon Doctrine. He has never been willing to explain it directly and on the record. It was originally set forth in a press briefing at Guam on his way to Southeast Asia in July, 1969. But direct quotation was not permitted. The transcript published by the *New York Times* was not only veiled by indirect discourse but Nixon himself a few days later seemed to contradict himself. On Guam he seemed to be charting disengagement; in the speeches which followed, notably in Thailand, he seemed to be taking on heavier commitments. Was he planning to get out, or digging in deeper?

Food For Peace — Uh, i.e. War

An investigation into the military assistance program has been launched by Senator Proxmire as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. It provides fresh facts and perspectives for a study of the dollars *and sense* of the Nixon Doctrine. Unfortunately this was lost to sight in certain sensational tidbits which came out of the hearings. One was the discovery that Food for Peace is used to generate money to buy weapons for war. The House Agriculture Committee then admitted belatedly that such use of Food for Peace funds was actually authorized by the original enabling act 17 years ago, and that more than $1.3 billion had been used for military purposes since. Then there was the related revelation that no one really knows in how many different ways we give military aid nor exactly how much it all adds up to. The only item clearly—but deceptively—labelled military assistance in the current budget totals $409 million. But this is only what Fulbright called "the tip of the iceberg."

Two Pentagon officials, pressed for a complete total at the hearings, got out their pencils in a moment of high comedy, disagreed between themselves and finally came up with a total of nearly $4.9 billion, or almost ten times as much. Fulbright introduced a table of his own showing more than $6.9 billion in military assistance and sales for the next fiscal year. He estimated that total military outflow from the U.S. since 1945 might add up to $175 billion! This is what Proxmire meant when he said military assistance suffered from "*un*management" and had become "a giant discount supermarket with no checkout counters, no cash registers, no store manager." To enable other countries to utilize all the splendid toys we give away, we have a Military Assistance Training Program. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Selden disclosed that since the end of World War II we have trained 320,000 military men from more than 70 countries. This, he said affords many foreign military men "an exposure to all that is inherent in what we think of as the American Way." No doubt Brazil and Greece are examples of this beneficent indoctrination.

The Nixon Doctrine is only a variant of the policy which has led us since World War II to man the frontiers of containment with foreign armies, as the Romans once used barbarians on the limits of their empire. The Proxmire committee brought to public attention for the first time a "Joint Strategic Operating Plan" drawn up each year by our Joint Chiefs of Staff. This, according to Townsend Hoopes, who was

(Continued On Page Four)

We Can't Contain China And Still Disengage

The problem that I have with large-scale military assistance to Southeast Asia [under the Nixon Doctrine] is simply that we cannot, on the one hand, really expect any of these nations to be a substitute for the United States if the purpose is to contain Communist China. On the other hand, both China and Vietnam are likely to continue to aid and assist insurgent movements for a long time to come. If this is true then I have serious doubts that large-scale military assistance is in fact going to result in either U.S. disengagement or in political stability in that part of the world. The more insurgency the more counter-insurgency and repression is almost inevitable.

—*Former Under Secty of State Katzenbach to the Jt. Econ. Com. hearings on military assistance Jan. 5.*

*** Latest example: "This Administration," he said in his appeal to the younger generation at the University of Nebraska Jan. 13, "has no higher priority than to end the war in a way that will bring lasting peace." (Emphasis added.) This implies that his first priority is not ending the war but ending it in such a way as to "bring lasting peace." What does this mean? How can this distant and limited Asian war have so decisive an impact on all the problems of mankind as to bring a lasting peace? Or does he believe a victory for the United States is necessary to make others afraid to challenge us elsewhere? If so, we are back with Pax Americana delusions.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Amalgam of Provocateurs and Imprudent (Wiretapped) Remarks? . . .

POLITICS, TOO, HAS ITS FASHIONS and kidnapping is in style. Sooner or later some far-out group in this country is going to try it. When they do, it's going to set back the whole peace movement, just as the Wisconsin bombing set back the student movement. Tactics of this kind (but only when the victim is unhurt) may have some desperate justification in military dictatorships like Brazil and Greece, where the regimes torture political prisoners. They have neither moral justification nor sense in a society like ours which is still relatively free. We were sorry to see Wm. Kunstler begin his defense of the Berrigan group by comparing charges to the Reichstag fire. Old radicals, like old generals, are always refighting the last war. But hysteria and hyperbole can only help us lose our way. Nixon is not Hitler; the Republicans are not Nazis; the Capitol has not been set afire. We hope the coming trial will not be turned into another circus like Chicago. We are impressed with the passionate conviction of the priests and nuns and lay people in this group; we believe their denials. We suspect that the FBI through wiretaps and informers may be hoping to add two and two and try to make it add up to 13. Groups which feel impelled to violent non-violence are sitting ducks for the secret police. A combination of provocateurs and imprudent remarks may be woven via "conspiracy" into a sensational net. The honor of the accused—all people of deep religious devotion—and of our country—which would be shamed by a frameup—call for sober defense and careful trial. This means, among other things, allowing the Berrigans free access to their lawyers outside the hearing of prison guards and bugged prison walls. We think the kidnapping charge is a fake, and we know there are forces in the Administration which would like to smear the peace movement with it. But the charges in this case do not involve utterances or ideas protected by the First Amendment.

ANGELA DAVIS IS A BRILLIANT YOUNG WOMAN driven to revolutionary views and associations by the suffering of her people. But the seizure and killing of a Judge—and the supply of arms with which to do it—are not acts for which any society, irrespective of *isms*, hands out medals. Her defense has been hampered because some people wanted to defend what happened as a revolutionary act and others to attack it as a frame-up. The air has been cleared by her declaration of innocence and she deserves the widest possible support for a fair trial. That trial must also and inevitably become a trial of our racist society. Looked at from the lower depths of black ghetto and prison, it looks far different than to white middle class liberals like ourselves. We consign people like the Soledad brothers to hells, and it will be good for us all if the trial shows us our country's ugly underside. We applaud the invitation to Soviet intellectuals to attend, and think this would be therapeutic for both societies.

A 7-TO-2 MAJORITY on the Supreme Court (but with the two Nixon appointees withholding full approval) has ruled that under the Voting Rights Act Mississippi cannot change voting practices "in even a minor way" without approval of a special 3-judge court in Washington or the Attorney General. But the day before the Court handed down its opinion, Aaron Henry revealed at a press conference here in Washington with Congressman Conyers of Detroit how little protection there was in the Attorney General's supervision. Mitchell has approved two measures taken by the white supremacists. He gave six Mississippi counties permission to wipe their voter registration slates clean, thus undoing what Henry called "ten years of blood and sweat" which had increased Mississippi's black voters from 10,000 to 214,000. Mitchell also approved a plan which this year will make Mississippi the only state that does not list candidates by party affiliation. This does away

Relief Roll Realities

If you are black in Alabama you cannot get welfare unless you agree to have white sponsors for whom you must work as a maid. For the mother who bears more than her 'quota' of illegitimate children, she and the children are denied food assistance benefits in some cities of our country. If you work only during the harvest season to pick sugarbeets or grapes or oranges, you will not meet the residence requirements for public assistance in other communities. The welfare system is a perfect unhappy example of the dangers of the latest fad of local control. Local governments run welfare assistance programs even though each State program is financed in part by the Federal Government. In 1969, nearly 54 percent of the total welfare costs were paid by the Federal government, but each State operates and administers programs according to its own discretion. The sad repressive result is that those hometown officials who are least responsive to the needs of the poor can deny them benefits to which they are legally entitled.—*Kennedy in the Senate Dec. 29 (abridged).*

The Stronger Our Satellites Become, The More Military Aid They Blackmail

When South Korea was attacked in 1950, it possessed a ragtag army of 100,000 men and no clear security commitment from the United States. Today the ROK Army is five times larger, and also far better trained, better equipped and better positioned. It outnumbers its North Korean counterpart 540,000 to 345,000, and has an air force of 24,000 that is beginning to include the F-4. There is now, moreover, the most explicit U.S. treaty commitment to defend South Korea against attack, and to this are added various U.N. resolutions, including the threat that, in the event of an attack on South Korea, the U.N. response might not be confined to Korea.

These factors create a prospect which is, to understate the case, unattractive for North Korea if it should be contemplating an attempt to unify the country by force. Moreover, there is nothing in the record to indicate that China is anxious to assume high risks for the sake of North Korea; indeed, it is clear in retrospect that China's participation in the 1950-53 Korean War was reluctant, and largely provoked by General MacArthur's insistent sweep to the Yalu River boundary—a move that was contrary to President Truman's understanding and quite possibly in defiance of Truman's instructions.

The military balance in Korea is thus rather favorable, and the wider threat does not seem unmanageable. Nevertheless, President Nixon, in his message to Congress of November 18, expressed the view that South Korean forces need a much larger military assistance program. Not only did he request authority to transfer all of the modern equipment that will be left behind by 20,000 U.S. forces now scheduled to be withdrawn—a reasonable proposition; he also requested another $150 million for further modernization of South Korean forces. Congress would be well advised to examine more closely the question as to why such a robust increase is either a military or a political requisite for the withdrawal.

—Townsend Hoopes, former Dep'y Ass't Secy of Defense for military assistance before the Jt. Econ. Com. Jan. 5 (abr).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Saigon Already Claims 90% of Its POWs Don't Want to Go Home

with primaries and undercuts the racially mixed Democratic Party of the State of Mississippi which the 1968 national convention recognized. In addition the Secretary of State of Mississippi has ruled that the party cannot refuse to register lily-white opposition candidates as loyal Democrats. This will protect their seniority in Congress—and their racism.

ANOTHER WARNING OF A POW WRANGLE like that which delayed a Korean settlement by 18 months and 140,000 casualties was a story from Saigon in the *Los Angeles Times* Dec. 23 which said South Vietnamese officials were "embarrassed" because almost 90% of the North Vietnamese prisoners they hold do not want to go home. These officials "deny having conducted any specific poll" but say they learned this by infiltrating agents into POW camps "and holding 'voluntary' indoctrination sessions." The South Vietnamese, like the South Koreans, would like to delay U.S. withdrawal. A long wrangle over "voluntary repatriation" could delay a settlement —and return of our own men—for a long time (see our issues of Dec. 28 and Jan. 11). Official U.S. statements here and in Paris speak of *releasing* rather than exchanging prisoners. The wording foreshadows trouble.

TWO CONGRESSIONAL LIBERALS DIFFERED on the President's action in giving business a $2.6 billion tax reduction in the shape of liberalized rules for depreciating new equipment. Proxmire hailed it, Reuss attacked it. The latter said that with 25% of present plant and equipment idle, the problem was not to stimulate new capital spending but "to spur consumer demand." A survey by the *Wall Street Journal* Jan. 12 showed that business executives and conservative economist Milton Friedman agree with Reuss. The only effect will be to increase the "cash flow" by reducing tax liabilities. Proxmire said he hoped Nixon would be "equally active in pushing programs to create jobs, retrain manpower . . ." But Nixon has just finished vetoing bills to create public employment and manpower training for the jobless. Congressman Vanik (*D. Ohio*) pointed out that the new depreciation rules really reinstate in another form the 7% investment tax credit repealed by Congress.

JOURNALISM NOTE: The heads of Chase Manhattan, Time, Inc., A.T.&T., and General Motors signed a statement calling for a $20 billion cut in the Pentagon budget, but neither the signers nor the cut were mentioned in an *AP* dispatch buried on p. 12 of the *New York Times* Jan. 15 (though discussed in Reston's column the same day). The statement, released by Sol Linowitz for the National Urban Coalition, was a curtain-raiser for an "alternative budget" and 5-year "rebuild America" plan this prestigious group will release after Nixon's budget message. That should stir fruitful debate.

SOME MYSTERY ATTACHES TO THE LATEST "protective reaction" strikes against missile sites in North Vietnam. The U.S. claims that fighter-bombers accompanying reconnaissance planes fire on the missiles when their radars fasten on the planes in preparation for firing. The Shrike is an ingenious missile built to "shoot down the barrel" of the enemy's own radar beam and ride it to the missile site. The way to use the Shrike is to "flush" the enemy by threatening passes, getting them to turn on their radar. Until the radar is turned on, the Shrike is unable to hit its target. Thus the game is to provoke a "protective reaction" on the part of the enemy. On the other hand if the enemy suddenly shuts off the radar beam, the Shrike loses its guidance and falls free, landing anywhere, including villages and other populated areas. This counter-tactic may explain why communiques are often so vague as to whether the Shrikes had actually hit their target.

Double Standard For Welfare Recipients

The question is whether receipt of largesse from government makes the home of the beneficiary subject to access by an inspector. Judge Skelly Wright stated the problem succinctly, "Welfare has long been considered charity and its recipients have been subjected to dehumanizing experiences in efforts to police welfare payments. Over half a billion dollars are spent annually for administering and policing the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program. No such sums are spent policing the government subsidies granted to farmers, airlines, steamship companies and junk mail dealers." It may be that other frauds, less obvious, will be perpetrated. But if inspectors wish to enter against the wishes of the lady of the house, they must get a warrant. The need for exigent action as in "hot pursuit" is not present for the lady will not disappear; nor will the baby. The values of the home protected by the 4th Amendment are not peculiar to capitalism; they are equally relevant to the new form of socialism which we are entering. As the number of functionaries and inspectors multiply, the need for protection of the individual becomes more essential if the values of a free society are to remain.

—Justice Douglas dissenting from the new "Nixon era" 6-to-3 Supreme Court decision allowing welfare inspectors to enter homes without a warrant (abr).

A Pro-Military Senator On The Lessons To Be Derived From The Vietnamese War

The first lesson is that in the future there must be a declaration of war by the Congress with respect to these engagements unless, of course, there is some major Pearl Harbor-type attack on the country. The Vietnam war is now the longest war in our history. Only by a direct vote in the Congress can there be a real test of the sentiment of the country for supporting any war and mobilizing all our resources. I totally reject the concept that the President has certain inherent powers as Commander-in-Chief which enable him to extensively commit major forces to combat without Congressional consent.

This Asian war as well as other factors necessitate a reassessment of our worldwide commitments. First of all, the Vietnam war teaches us that the limitations of our manpower and resources will not permit us to aid every Asian nation any time it is confronted with a Communist threat both from within and without. Moreover, we must make certain that a preponderant proportion of the people in a country must be willing to adhere to the principles of freedom and be united in their willingness to defend their freedoms to the death if necessary. I think that the extent to which the Vietnam war problem was a civil war was not fully recognized in the beginning.

I anticipate that one of the hardest fought battles in this new session will be the extension of the Selective Service induction authority. Without the draft a significant element of our combat forces will become ineffective in a short period of time. Let me say a word on the current discussion of reaching a zero draft call and having an all volunteer armed force. I do not oppose this effort in principle. It is a flight from reality and will be impossible to achieve. So long as the Vietnam war is on our hands there is no hope of having a volunteer Army. In Vietnam today, out of every 100 riflemen in a company, that is, the men who actually carry the M-16 rifles and slug it out in the mud, only about 15 are true volunteers. Only about 2% of the men who enlist select the specialty of a rifleman in the infantry.

—Senator Stennis in Jackson, Miss. Jan. 11 (abr.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No Amount of Military Assistance Can Make Giants of Pygmies

(Continued From Page One)

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense from 1965 to 1967, presumes to establish "the desirable size and composition of the military forces of nearly every sovereign non-Communist nation in the world" with the incremental aid required to bring them up to JCS standards. The totals were described as "astronomical." They are not likely to grow smaller as we proceed with "Vietnamization" under the Nixon Doctrine. For this seems to assume that, as American troops withdraw and military aid is increased, Saigon, Bangkok, Manila and Seoul will take over the task of containing China. But, as Hoopes said, military assistance no matter how large "cannot make giants out of pygmies; it cannot determine the military balance of Asia."

Another Hawk Begins To Coo

Both Hoopes and former Under Secretary of State Katzenbach saw the Nixon Doctrine as an effort to put off the necessary task of coming to terms with China. As long as we finance China's containment, China will support insurgencies to counteract our efforts. "If this is true," Katzenbach told the committee, "then I have serious doubts that large-scale military assistance is going to result either in U.S. disengagement or in political stability in that part of the world." He saw our support of large-scale military forces in these small countries as inhibiting their economic development, and delaying political settlements with insurgent forces. Proxmire asked what would have happened if in 1964-65, instead of putting more aid and troops into Vietnam, "we had withdrawn and forced an accommodation." Would this have created "a more stable and over-all better situation from the standpoint of American national interests?" Katzenbach, a hawk in Johnson's day, replied, "I would think, in retrospect, yes."

Military assistance breeds Canutes. It encourages the effort to confront political and economic problems with force. It exacerbates economic distress by imposing the burden of large armies, and intensifies rebellion by repression. This is why "Vietnamization" failed to work when the French tried it, and when Eisenhower and Kennedy followed suit. Nixon is trying to get back where they started. As Proxmire said, it is not just the waste of money but the fact that military assistance tends to be self-defeating. Yet, as Katzenbach pointed out, the Pentagon is using the Nixon Doctrine as justification for increased arms shipments. Its many military missions abroad acquire a vested interest in maintaining the arms flow on which their cushy foreign assignments depend. Empire provides them with a life more luxurious than they could enjoy at home, as it did Britain's younger sons in the Nineteenth century. The means become the end, and the military establishment has the same kind of stake in military assistance as in tension and the arms race.

But delusions die hard. A witness from Rand Corporation testified that the solution lay in special training for military assistance teams so that their "inevitable involvement" in the political life of the countries where they are stationed would be "a conscious, deliberate process in the hands of competent, politically informed military-political analysts!" This is a distant echo of the white man's burden, of our smug belief we can govern other people's lives better than they can, of that imperialism cloaked in liberalism which got us into the Southeast Asian morass. It takes us all the way back to the Boy Scout branch of the CIA, and to the Lansdales and Leo Chernes who were going to make an enlightened ruler of Ngo Dinh Diem. At the risk of being accused of dialectical materialism, we note that this witness's recipe differed principally from the Pentagon's in providing jobs for "military-political analysts" —like RAND's maybe. *January 18*

Corruption—Semantic And Otherwise

The most shocking concealment of military assistance funds in terms of rhetorical techniques concerns the Food for Peace Program. According to the budget document, "This program, closely linked to the AID program, combats hunger and malnutrition, promotes economic growth in developing countries, and develops and expands export markets for U.S. commodities." That is a direct quotation from the Act. Yet, we find that in the past six years nearly $700 million of Food for Peace funds have been channeled into military assistance programs. In 1970 $108 million worth of Food for Peace has gone for military aid to foreign governments. To continue using Food for Peace funds for military purposes is, to say the least, a corruption of the English language.

—Proxmire's opening statement at the military assistance hearings before the Joint Econ. Com. Jan. 4.

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy Of This Issue To A Friend If You Send Us A Long, Stamped, Self Addressed Envelope

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed special pre-publication price of $8.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, **Polemics and Prophecies: 1967-70** (Random House). Regularly $10.

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 1/25/71

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly, 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED